

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

Applicants thank the Examiner for removing the §112 rejections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,838,177). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants maintain that their combination of a low photoinitiator concentration and natural light used to cure a surface to a non-tacky finish is not taught or suggested by Fenn et al. The Fenn et al. teachings require at least twice as much photoinitiator and provide no expectation of success in using less. The use of artificial light adds a degree of control and predictability that cannot be automatically matched with the use of sunlight. The formulation, curing times, and conditions of Fenn et al. were made with that degree of control. The Fenn et al. mandate of 1 to 8% or more of photoinitiator was made with that degree of predictability. The modifications and differences between Applicants' choice of specific photoinitiators, species of ethylenically unsaturated compounds, and curing conditions were made to provide a synergy to the system to provide rapid curing in either sunlight or artificial light. Any modifications of Fenn et al. to use natural light and a significantly reduced amount of photoinitiator cannot provide any predictable success.

Further, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to alter the teachings of Fenn et al. with the mandate of 1 to 8% or more of photoinitiator and the lack of teaching

regarding the use of natural light and arrive at Applicants' 0.1 to 0.49% photoinitiator which is cured by sunlight. Accordingly, the §103 rejection of the claims is not supported by the Fenn et al. disclosure. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 19, 2007

By: Anna M. Budde
Anna M. Budde, Reg. No. 35,085

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

AMB/SDJ/tp